



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,760	03/09/2004	Yaron Y. Goland	BEAS-01452US1	4358
23910	7590	09/24/2007		
FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 CALIFORNIA STREET 14TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			EXAMINER BOUTAH, ALINA A	
			ART UNIT 2143	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/24/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/796,760	Applicant(s) GOLAND, YARON Y.	
	Examiner Alina N. Boutah	Art Unit 2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/13/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat et al. (US 2002/0152299) in view of Bern et al. (USPN 6,898,422).

Regarding claim 1, Traversat teaches a system for message ordering in a message oriented network, independently of any conversation processing, comprising:

a sender or a plurality of senders, that sends messages (see Traversat, figures 1A and 1B- "source peer device;" [0064]- "one of the peers may generate messages to send to the other peer);

a receiver or a plurality of receivers, that receives messages (see Traversat, figures 1A and 1B - "destination peer device;" [0064]- "the destination peer may receive the window of N transmitted messages); and,

wherein, for a group of messages that are to be processed in a particular order, each of said senders associate their messages with a sequence number, so that the receivers can identify messages and process those messages in the particular order (see Traversat, abstract: "each message may include sequence number configured for use in maintaining ordering of received

Art Unit: 2143

messages on a receiving peer; ” also see [0065] for more detailed description on how the ordering of the messages is processed).

Traversat also discloses using a universal unique identifier (UUID) to guarantee that each peer in a peer group is unique (see Traversat, i.e. [0080]).

However, Traversat does not explicitly teach including a sequence group identifier with the sequence number in the message so that that the receivers can identify messages having common sequence group identifiers and cooperate amongst themselves to process those messages in the particular order.

In an analogous art, Bern teaches using a sequence group identifier, followed by a sequence number in a message in order for a client to retrieve a specific corresponding message from a server (see Bern: col. 2, lines 48-65: “unique identifiers”). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a sequence group identifier in addition to a sequence number in order to uniquely identify a message (see Bern: col. 2, lines 48-65), thus ensuring that messages will be processed as specified.

Regarding claim 2, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the sender is a client of a server and the receiver or receivers are services operating at said server (see Traversat, [0019]).

Regarding claim 3, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the receiver or receivers are Web Services adapted to receive messages from a sender (see Traversat, [0073]).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 4, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the system includes a plurality of senders and a plurality of receivers (see Traversat, figure 1A).

Regarding claim 5, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the sequence group identifier is specified by the sender (see Traversat, abstract, [0064]).

Regarding claim 6, Traversat fails to explicitly teach the system of claim 1 wherein the sequence groups identifier is randomly chosen as a universally unique identifier. In an analogous art, Bern teaches using a universally unique identifier as a sequence group identifier (see Bern: col. 2, lines 48-65). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a universally unique identifier in order to uniquely identify a message (see Bern: col. 2, lines 48-65), thus ensuring that messages will be processed as specified.

Regarding claim 7, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the system includes a plurality of receivers and the plurality of receivers communicate amongst themselves to process the messages in the particular order (see Traversat, abstract: "each message may include sequence number configured for use in maintaining ordering of received messages on a receiving peer; " also see [0065] for more detailed description on how the ordering of the messages is processed).

Regarding claim 8, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the system includes a plurality of receivers and each message includes a previous designation identifier listing the previous destination of a message in the sequence, and wherein the subsequent receiver of a message in the sequence can verify that the message has been processed at the previously designated receiver (see Traversat: [0165]).

Regarding claim 9, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the message may be represented by an alias either at the sender or the receiver for use by that sender or receiver (see Traversat: [0060]).

Regarding claim 10, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the system includes a plurality of senders, and the senders use a multiple source relay process to determine which sender may send a new message (see Traversat: [0068] – passing messages through one or more router). However, Traversat does not explicitly teach sending messages in a specified SGI. In an analogous art, Bern teaches sending messages including a sequence number and SGI to retrieve messages (see Bern: col. 2, lines 48-65: “unique identifiers”). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a sequence group identifier in addition to a sequence number in order to uniquely identify a message (see Bern: col. 2, lines 48-65), thus ensuring that messages will be processed as specified.

Regarding claim 11, Traversat teaches the system of claim 1 wherein the system includes a plurality of senders, and the senders use a multiple source sub-context model to determine

Art Unit: 2143

which sender may send a new message (see Traversat: [0174]). However, Traversat does not explicitly teach sending a message in a specified SGI. In an analogous art, Bern teaches sending messages including a sequence number and SGI to retrieve messages (see Bern: col. 2, lines 48-65: "unique identifiers"). At the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a sequence group identifier in addition to a sequence number in order to uniquely identify a message (see Bern: col. 2, lines 48-65), thus ensuring that messages will be processed as specified.

Claims 12-22 list the same elements as claims 1-11, respectively, but in method form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1-11 applies equally as well to claims 12-22.

Claims 23-33 list the same elements as claims 1-11, respectively, but in computer-readable medium form rather than system form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1-11 applies equally as well to claims 23-33.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. US 2002/0091846 submitted by Garcia-Luna-Aceves et al.
2. US 2002/0042830 submitted by Bose et al.
3. US 2003/0110227 submitted by O'Hagan.

Art Unit: 2143

4. US 2003/0110230 submitted by Holdsworth et al.
5. US 2007/0016647 submitted by Czerwinski et al.
6. US 2002/0175950 submitted by Kuiken et al.
7. US 2004/0230652 submitted by Estrada et al.
8. US 2004/0083263 submitted by Richardson et al.
9. US 2004/0010538 submitted by Miller et al.
10. US 2001/0042099 submitted by Peng.
11. US 2003/0212820 submitted by deCarmo.
12. US 2004/0103196 submitted by Block et al.
13. US 6,883,014 issued to McErlean.
14. US 6,128,283 issued to Sabaa et al.
15. US 7,203,658 issued to Gidwani et al.
16. US 7,039,914 issued to Potter.
17. US 6,447,097 issued to Folkins et al.
18. US 6,886,044 issued to Miles al.
19. US 6,775,707 issued to Bennett et al.
20. Currie, David; "Grouping messages using the WebSphere MQ Java and JMS APIs," IBM, printed August 2007, pages 1-9.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alina N. Boutah whose telephone number is 571-272-3908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00 am - 5:00 pm).

Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Alina Boutah
Patent Examiner
AU 2143